

Docket No.: 40101/09901

REMARKS**I. INTRODUCTION**

Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1-11 remain pending in the present application. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable.

II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1-8, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "AAPA"). (See 10/04/07 Office Action, p. 3).

AAPA describes a method by which user tasks may access resources controlled by the operating system. To do so, a user task must execute a system call, which causes the processor to execute a "trap" routine that makes a function call to the desired operating system resources. The user task "cannot directly access the instructions and data structures in the system space it wishes to access, but rather must employ a special access procedure." (Specification, p. 2, ll. 25-26.) This access procedure requires another task to be created by the operating system in the system space in order to perform the requested action. This procedure increases system-processing overhead and execution time. (See Specification, p. 2, ll. 14-31.)

In responding to the arguments the Applicant previously made the Examiner asserts that, "there is no limitation for a user to directly access the instructions and data structures in the system space it wishes to access" and there is no limitation against employing "a special access procedure." (See 10/04/07 Office Action, p. 5). As such, claim 1 has been amended to recite

A computer system, comprising:

a memory space having a number of memory locations;

an operating system located within a system space, the system space

corresponding to a first subset of the number of memory locations of the

memory space; a software module located within a user space, the user

Docket No.: 40101/09901

space corresponding to a second subset of the number of memory locations of the memory space; a plurality of operating system data structures located in the system space; a system page located within the system space and corresponding to a portion of the first subset of the number of memory locations, the system page including a subset of the plurality of operating system data structures; a function located within the software module; and a display for displaying an output of the software module to a user; *wherein the function has direct access to the subset of the plurality of operating system data structures but may not be linked to the remainder of the first subset of the number of memory locations.*

Applicant submits that newly amended claim 1 is now in condition for allowance and the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn. Because claims 2-8, 10 and 11 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for stating that claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. (See 10/04/07 Office Action, p. 5). However, based on the above amendment, and remarks, Applicant submits that claim 9, as is written, is in condition for allowance.


Docket No.: 40101/09901

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 04, 2007

By: 
Michael Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, NY 10038
Phone: 212-619-6000
Fax: 212-619-0276